

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BRYANT E. PARKS,  
Plaintiff,

-v-

MONTEFIORE MEDICAL CENTER,  
Defendant.

23-CV-4945 (JPO)

ORDER

J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge:

In its Opinion and Order dated February 3, 2025, the Court granted Defendant the motion filed by Montefiore Medical Center (“Montefiore”) to dismiss *pro se* Plaintiff Bryant Parks’s amended complaint in its entirety. (ECF No. 50 (“February 3, 2025 Opinion and Order”).) However, the Court afforded Parks the opportunity to clarify “(1) whether or not he asked Montefiore to work remotely before he was fired, and (2) whether or not remote security positions were available at the time he was fired.” (*Id.* at 8.) Parks submitted a letter on March 3, 2025, indicating that he never requested remote work prior to his termination (though he disputes whether he or Montefiore should have had the responsibility to raise the prospect of remote work) and that he does not know whether there were any remote positions available at the time of his termination. (*See* ECF No. 54 at 1.) The Court construes Parks’s letter as a motion to amend the Court’s judgment, filed within twenty-eight days as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). Because Parks’s failure to allege that he requested a remote-work accommodation and that remote work was available at the time of his termination formed the basis for granting Montefiore’s motion to dismiss, Parks’s most recent letter presents no basis for amending the February 3, 2025 Opinion and Order.

Because the foregoing disposes of Parks's appropriately filed motion to amend the Court's judgment, the thirty-day deadline to file an appeal runs from the date of this Order. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(A)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 7, 2025  
New York, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. PAUL OETKEN  
United States District Judge